

So when the country next-door was attacked 4 hours later, the military still was not prepared.

There are millions of questions about what happened that night. Were we overwhelmed by a highly organized military force? Was it a street protest that went violent like the administration first claimed? The administration claims the attack was so overwhelming that additional American security forces would not have made a difference.

I know how we can resolve this issue: release the video of that attack that night. For some reason, the administration cannot identify the killers that night because none of them have been brought to justice a year and a half later. I have an idea: if the administration cannot identify them, show the world the video of the attack and let the world help identify who that is.

If there is a bank robbery, the next day the video footage is on television so that everyone can figure out who that person is and they can be brought to justice. That is standard practice for the FBI here. Why is the video of the attack in Benghazi being withheld? If you cannot figure out who attacked the compound, ask CNN or FOX News or The New York Times. They have all interviewed the people who attacked the compound, but the administration can't seem to find them. Many Americans have not even heard there is high quality, multiple angle video footage of that night, both on the ground and from the air in drones.

There is only one reason why the administration will not release the video: they do not want the American people to see what really happened that night and to see that two additional security personnel would have made a huge difference. We need to release the video, allow the American people to see what really happened. Let's get these questions answered.

BREAKING THE IMPASSE IN BANGLADESH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, the political standoff between the two main political parties in Bangladesh has rocked that country and threatened its democracy, its stability, and its economic progress.

Throughout 2013 and in the run-up to elections last week, a series of general strikes paralyzed Bangladesh, and hundreds were killed in clashes between rival political factions. Opposition leaders and human rights activists were arrested, and Bangladeshi courts were used to target opposition figures and their sympathizers.

The feud in Bangladesh pits Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, the leader of the ruling Awami League party, against Khaleda Zia, a former Prime Minister who is the leader of the opposition Bangladesh Nationalist Party, or

BNP. The leaders, known to their countrymen as the "two ladies," have dominated Bangladeshi politics since democracy was restored in the mid-1990s, when Hasina's Awami positioned itself as secular and social democratic in ideology and Zia's BNP as more centrist and religious.

Tense relations between the two women and their supporters were further inflamed last year when a third party allied with BNP was barred from participating in the elections and the government declined to dissolve itself in favor of a caretaker government that would exist only to supervise the elections. This had been the custom in Bangladesh in prior elections.

Prime Minister Hasina's actions convinced Ms. Zia that BNP would be better served by boycotting the polling, which the BNP did in the hopes that the government would be pressured into resigning before the vote. When the government did not accede to the BNP's demands, the opposition took to the street. But the government held firm and, amid diminished voter turnout and widespread violence, Awami swept last week's vote, deepening the crisis.

Born from a brutal civil war in 1971, Bangladesh has faced enormous challenges in its 43-year history—endemic poverty, one of densest populations in the world, and unpredictable weather that both sustains and destroys the country's year-round agricultural production.

Governance, too, has been a challenge, with the country consistently ranked among the world's most corrupt and the nation's institutions highly politicized. And nothing has come to symbolize the failure of governance like the garment industry and its horrific record on worker safety, a record that threatens the cornerstone of Bangladesh's economy.

In spite of these and a host of other challenges, Bangladesh has made remarkable strides. According to a report issued by the World Bank last June, from 2000 until 2010, Bangladesh experienced steady and strong GDP growth of nearly 6 percent per year on average. Even so, about a third of Bangladeshis live in poverty, and economic hardship is especially prevalent in the rural parts of the country.

Given the country's history, its recent progress and the hurdles remaining, if Bangladesh is to reach its goal of becoming a middle-income country by 2021, the question of governance is central and makes the political standoff that has gripped the country even more tragic and counterproductive. Bangladesh's middle-income aspirations are contingent on a significant rise in GDP growth and a broad reform agenda, neither of which is possible under current conditions.

Fortunately, there is a precedent that could allow for an exit from the impasse through new elections. In February 1996, elections were boycotted by Awami and other opposition parties,

and the BNP took nearly all of the seats, touching off a crisis of legitimacy similar to that now gripping Dhaka. Four months later, new elections were held under the auspices of a caretaker government, and the outcome favored Awami.

Now, as then, the time has come for cooler heads to prevail and for a new election to be called that will give all parties the time and space needed to organize and campaign. The recent release of Ms. Zia from house arrest should be followed by the release of others detained for political reasons. There should be a mutual pledge of nonviolence, guarantees of noninterference in political campaigning by police and security forces, and a pledge to respect the people's mandate.

The people of Bangladesh, who have suffered mightily and who have also risen to every challenge over the course of more than four decades, deserve better than to be caught between two stubborn matriarchs. New elections should be scheduled and Bangladeshi voters given a free and fair chance in determining their country's future.

THE WRONG DIRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to take up the omnibus appropriations bill for 2014, and I rise this morning to outline my objections to this measure.

This is not the "regular order" promised to the American people in which each of the 12 appropriations bills is painstakingly vetted. It is all 12 bills rolled into one, with no opportunity for meaningful debate or amendment. True, it adheres to the budget that was passed in December, but that budget is nothing to brag about. That budget destroyed the only meaningful constraint on Federal spending that we have.

One Member said he is surprised by opposition because "this bill, for the 4th year in a row, cuts discretionary spending." Well, it only cuts it by Washington math. Last year, the discretionary spending of the United States Government was \$986 billion. The measure appropriates \$1,012 billion. That is an increase. And it is \$45 billion more than the sequester would have allowed. After all, they didn't blow the lid off the sequester because they wanted to cut spending, now did they?

So what is this money going for?

Well, it increases money for Head Start by \$600 million, despite the fact that every credible study has concluded that this program provides no lasting benefit for children;

It continues wasteful TIGER grants, which, under the guise of transportation, puts money into projects like a 6-mile pedestrian mall in Fresno and streets that actually discourage automobile traffic;